DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 135 227 FL 008 383

AUTHOR	Guitart, Jorge M.
TITLE	Question of Language Loyalty. Lektos: Interdisciplinary Working Papers in Language Sciences, Special Issue.
INSTITUTION	Louisville Univ., Ky. Interdisciplinary Program in Linguistics.
SPONS AGENCY	National Endowment for the Humanities (NFAH), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	77
GRANT	H-10953
NOTE	17p.; Paper presented at the special session on "Sociolinguistics and the Teaching of Modern Languages" at the annual meeting of the Modern Language Association (New York, New York, December 1976)
AVAILABLE FROM	University of Louisville, Interdisciplinary Program in Linguistics, Room 214 Humanities, Louisville, Kentucky 40208
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Bilingual Education; *Bilingualism; Educational Policy; English (Second Language); *Ethnic Groups; Group Unity; *Language Attitudes; Language Enrollment; *Language Instruction; *Language Planning; Language Role; Language Usage; Native Speakers; Non English Speaking; Second Language Learning; Second Languages; Sociolinguistics
IDENTIFIERS	Fishman (Joshua); *Language Loyalty; *Language Maintenance

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the question of language loyalty in the United States and explores the implications that the institutional teaching of modern languages may have for ethnic language maintenance. The education of United States ethnics has always resulted in the loss of the ethnic tongue as a resource. However, although negative attitudes toward ethnicity, on the part of both ethnics themselves and non-ethnics, have been diminishing, ethnic cultural recovery does not automatically imply mother tongue recovery. In the past foreign language departments have treated U.S. ethnic tongues only as foreign (or second) languages. They are prepared to attend to the needs of those ethnics who are English-speaking monolinguals and who want to acquire as a second language the tongue of their cultural group but not to the needs of ethnics who are either monolingual in the ethnic tongue or bilingual in any degree. If the U.S. were to adopt a language planning policy that had as its specific goal the maintenance and development of ethnic tongues, it could not turn for expertise to the modern language field. The methodology for teaching ethnic language arts is still in its infancy and there is no general movement on the part of conventional language departments to aid in its development. However, if some significant attitudinal and methodological changes were made, no place would be more adequate than a language department to train teachers in the language and culture of a group or to turn students into educated users of their own native language. (Author/CFM)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS).

ED135227

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE QUESTION OF LANGUAGE LOYALTY[1]

Jorge M. Guitart
State University of New York at Buffalo

The term 'language loyalty' was introduced by Weinreich to designate the sentiment awakened in the speakers of an endangered language that will lead them to defend that language. He has defined it as follows:

> a principle--its specific content varies from case to case--in the name of which people will rally themselves and their fellow speakers consciously and explicitly to resist changes in either the functions of their language (as a result of language shift) or in the structure of vocabulary (as a consequence of interference) (Weinreich 1968:99)

"One would suspect," writes Weinreich, "that a rudiment of this feeling is natural in every user of the language". (1968:99) The numerous cases of language conflict throughout the ages certainly support this notion. Human experience being inextricably bound with language experience, it is natural that an attack on a language would be interpreted as an attack on its speakers, calling for some response. The intensity of the response will depend on the intensity of the threat, whether real or imagined. It may be very mild, as when a purist laments the use of a foreign word, or it may be very violent, as when speakers take to the streets and even lose their lives over some language issue. Language riots are not frequent but they do occur from time to time. At the time of this writing, mid 1976, deadly violence still rages in Soweto, South Africa, as a result of an official decision to impose Afrikaans as the language of education on Bantu groups.

While in the history of mankind many people have literally given their lives for their language, many others have surrendered theirs without putting up a fight, either in the real or figurative sense of the word. For language loyalty is awakened only when speakers have a positive attitude toward their tongue, which is not always the case. As Weinreich has pointed out, language loyalty is more intense in situations of language contact, but only if the mother tongue is seen both as superior to the encroaching language and as threatened by it. If the other language is perceived as more useful and/or prestigeful, 'betrayal' is the norm. When contact is due to immigration, it is normal for the children of immigrants to eventually abandon the language of their parents, even in cases where parents have remained loyal and are actively engaged in the defense of their tongue. In the absence of a strong sense of language loyalty, the parents themselves end up using--however imperfectly--the language of the host (and dominant) culture in their dealings with their own children. The foregoing phenomena are commonplace in the history of immigrant groups in the United States, a country where language maintenance efforts on behalf of non-English tongues in general have not been very successful and where language 'betrayal' has been the norm in situations of language contact.

FL008383

In 1966 Joshua Fishman and his colleagues published their monumental Language Loyalty in the United States (henceforth referred to as LLUS), where the travails of language-maintenance in the United States are extensively documented. In his integrative review at the end of that volume, Glazer (1966:361) summarized very aptly the fate suffered by non-English languages in the United States:

> Whether it was one of the great international tongues with a vast literature, such as German, Spanish, or French; or a language of peasants with a scanty literature or press, such as Ukrainian; or an exotic and proud language not widely known, such as Hungarian; or a language such as Yiddish, that incorporated in itself a major national and cultural movement--all, it seems, regardless of their position, their history, their strength, the character of the groups that brought them to this country and maintained them through one or two or three generations, have come to a similar condition. The newspapers die out; the schools, full-time and part-time, close; the organizations, religious or secular, shift to English; and the maintenance of the ethnic mother tongue becomes the desperate struggle of a small group committed to it, who will have to find their most effective future support less among the descendants of the immigrants who brought the language to this country than in governmental and educational institutions that might find some practical or scholarly value in training and maintaining a corps of experts who know and can use it.

As to the erosion of ethnic tongues along the generational scale, LLUS documents what has been the normal language experience of immigrant groups in America: the second generation gives up the language of their parents, especially in the many cases where the non-English tongue has been unpleasantly associated in the mind of the speakers with poverty, eccentricity, ignorance, and inarticulateness.

The view is advanced time and again in LLUS that language shift, or the abandonment of an ethnic tongue in favor of English, constitutes the loss of a valuable resource. Because it has been largely through Joshua Fishman's efforts that this view has been brought to the fore, we will equate the sociolinguistic philosophy expounded and espoused in LLUS regarding U.S. ethnic tongues and the national interest with that of Fishman himself. In describing Fishman's views with respect to the national resource character of ethnic tongues I find it useful to borrow from the terminology proposed by W. E. Lambert to describe the type of motivation behind a learner's desire to acquire a second language. Lambert (1967:102-03) calls instrumental motivation that of the individual who wants to learn another tongue for utilitarian purposes, such as getting a better position; and integrative motivation that of the speaker whose

purpose is to become like a member of the linguistic-cultural group that speaks that tongue. Giving the terms a slightly different connotation we could say that for Fishman, an ethnic tongue is a national resource both instrumentally and integratively. Instrumentally, it is to the advantage of the United States to have among its citizens people who can speak natively (and thus fluently and effectively) the languages of the foreign nations with whom this country has commercial and cultural relations, and also of course the languages of the nations with whom it has an adversary relation.

Integratively, it is to the advantage of an individual to speak the tongue of the linguistic-cultural group to which he belongs by birth, for then his existence is in Fishman's view more authentic.

Possibly no one would refute the usefulness of better communications between the United States and its allies and enemies alike. The greater authenticity of ethnic self-acceptance is equally useful but not so obvious. One could cite in support of Fishman the fact, already commonplace in social psychology, that the need to 'belong' ranks highly within the inventory of basic human needs. We will see later, however, that for some individuals ethnicity is not inseparable from language loyalty.

The Fishman volume is for the most a report on research about the status of U.S. ethnic tongues in general, with attention being given to several particular languages (viz. Spanish, German, Ukrainian, and French), but it is also in part a tract, a sort of manifesto advocating the desirability of active ethnic tongue maintenance in the United States.

Fishman's thesis could be summarized as follows: the United States, which is a multicultural nation, is also a multilingual nation, but is in danger of ceasing to be so to the detriment of all Americans. Therefore the maintenance and development of non-English tongues in the United States should be among the nation's priorities.

While aligning myself with Professor Fishman's desiderata for a multicultural-multilingual America, I would like in what follows to examine as critically as possible the question of language loyalty in the United States and explore the implications that the institutional teaching of modern languages may have for U.S. ethnic language maintenance.

Is the United States really a multilingual nation, and if so what are the dimensions of its linguistic heterogeneity? In 1970 the U.S. Bureau of the Census established that the population of this country was 203,210,258.[2] Of these, 193,590,856 were born here and 9,619,302 were foreign born. In turn, natives who gave their mother tongue as English added up to 159,019,288. While a total of 9,221,726 natives failed to report their mother tongue, 25,349,842 reported a mother tongue other than English. That is to say, in 1970 there were at least 25.3 million American-born individuals who did not speak English natively.[3] To this relatively large number add 5,125,330 foreign born U.S. residents who declared a mother tongue other than English. We arrived at the latter figure by subtracting from the total foreign born (9,619,302) the number of foreign born giving English as their mother tongue (1,697,825) and the number of foreign born who did not declare their mother tongue (96,147). And so there were at least 30 million people living in the United States in 1970 who declared that their mother tongue was not English, roughly 15% of the population.

Table I reproduces the 1970 Census data on mother tongues of the population, ranking the languages according to the number of claimants:

TABLE I

1.	Spanish	7 823 583
2.	German	6 093 054
3.	Italian	4 144 315
4.	French	2 598 408
5.	Polish	2 437 938
6.	Yiddish	1 593 993
7.	Swedish	626 102
8.	Norwegian	612 862
9.	Slovak	510 366
10.	Greek	458 699
11.	Czech	452 812
12.	Hungarian	447 497
13.	Japanese	408 504
14.	Portuguese	365 300
15.	Dutch	350 748
16.	Chinese	345 431
17.	Russian	334 615
18.	Lithuanian	292 820
19.	Ukrainian	249 351
20.	Serbo-Croatian	239 455
21.	Finnish	214 161
22.	Danish	194 462
23.	Arabic	193 520
24.	Slovenian	82 321
25.	Rumanian	56 590

The census data also include a figure of 268,205 for American Indian languages, an 'All Other' figure of 1,780,053 and a 'Not Reported' figure of 9,317,873.

The data reveal that for each of six languages other than English, there were more than one million people claiming it as their mother tongue. If we make the count progressively more inclusive, for each of nine languages there were more than half a million people; for each of 13 more than 400,000; for each of 21, more than 200,000; for each of 23, more than 150,000. These figures strike me as impressive.

We should however be as cautious as Fishman and Hofman (1966:34) were in their analysis of 1960 mother tongue data figures:

> It should be stressed at the outset that we are dealing here primarily with self-reported mother tongue claims rather than with indicators of current language use. The two variables are undoubtedly related to each other although the exact nature or consistency of the relationship is still unknown.

Nonetheless--and Fishman and Hofman would agree--the very act of claiming a non-English tongue is quite significant.

The language problems of the United States do not seem as pressing when compared to those of other large multilingual nations such as India, the Philippines, and the new African nations or to those of our bilingual neighbor to the North, Canada. The main problem afflicting many multilingual nations--that of establishing a national language which will function as the language of government, education, justice, etc.--does not exist in the United States. English was established historically as the national language long ago. At least 79.1 per cent of the U.S. population who spoke English natively in 1970 did not in theory have any problems communicating with government officials, administrators of justice, or teachers. But what about the 30 million native speakers of non-English tongues? Many of these of course also know English; many are bilingual to varying degrees. Historically, however, the norm in America has been not to make any concessions to bilinguals in the public use of English. Historically, all systems of language communication in America have been designed by English-speaking monolinguals who had only English-speaking monolinguals in mind.

If the medium was monolingual, the message was monocultural, most significantly in education where there were explicit directives to de-ethnicize the ethnics. For those who may think that the inveighings against the Melting Pot doctrine are unjustified and exaggerated, the following passage from Krickus (1976:99) may be quite instructive:

> On graduation day it was the practice in some schools to conduct a ritual which represented the rebirth of the immigrant child into an American. A large pot constructed out of wood and crepe paper stood in the center of the auditorium stage and the graduates entered the Melting Pot decked out in the apparel of the old country and came out the other side dressed resplendently in identical American clothes. This ritual represented, in fact, the growing estrangement of the second generation from their parents.

The metaphor of a melting pot is actually somewhat inaccurate in describing the process that ethnics have gone through in this land on their way to divesting themselves of their values, customs, and language. It would be more appropriate to speak of an Anglo-American assimilating pot. Glazer and Moynihan (1963) are right in saying that the Melting Pot did not happen. They had in mind the fact that no new American nationality has emerged from the combination of the several ethnic strains. But an assimilating process did occur and many people did come out on the other end with many more things Anglicized than their names.

On the other hand many others never went through that process. The latter were the casualties of an educational system that was not designed for them, the many non-English speaking monolinguals who never made it through the "Great School" for English-speaking monolinguals.

Nonassimilation was a common experience among so-called New Immigrants--the people from Southern and Eastern European nations who came in large numbers to America during the era of mass immigration, a period extending roughly from 1880 to 1924. (See Krickus 1976.) Greer (1972)

has found that New Immigrant children dropped out of school in large numbers with the educational failures far exceeding the successes.

These failures have been a negative source of language maintenance in America. The children who dropped out fell back into their ethnic communities where a knowledge of English was not necessary.

The experience has not been exclusive of the New Immigrants. Before the advent of publicly supported bilingual-bicultural elementary education, it was also the fate of many Puerto Rican and Mexican-American children who were largely monolingual in Spanish and of many American Indian children, equally nonproficient in the only language in which instruction was imparted.

In the history of the education of U.S. ethnics, it has turned out that diametrically opposed experiences have led in the end to the same negative result: the loss of the ethnic tongue as a resource, both instrumentally and integratively--to refer back to Fishman's thesis in Lambertian terms. Some people who went through the Anglo-American assimilating process lost both their language and their ethnic self-identification, while some people whose failure in school prevented them from being assimilated continued to be largely monolingual in a variety of their respective languages spoken by poor and uneducated folk--themselves and their elders--a variety in which it was difficult to take any pride.

Yet, it would be inaccurate to tell the history of the confrontation between Anglo-American education and ethnicity in the simple terms of an assimilated-non assimilated dichotomy. The individual who became educated and totally rejected his ethnic heritage--including the use of his parents' tongue--and the individual who remained uneducated and monolingual in a ghettoized environment are only the extremes of an experiential range.

Of particular interest to the issue of language maintenance are the many cases of dissociation between ethnic loyalty and language loyalty. It is not true that language shift is always a manifestation of ethnic self-rejection. In the United States there are many individuals who identify themselves as members of an ethnic group, whose cultural patterns are those of that group, but who have little or no proficiency in the ethnic mother tongue. More importantly, they have little or no motivation to speak that tongue. Fishman and Nahirny (1966:186) discovered that a significant proportion of American ethnic leaders were of the opinion that "the continuity of ethnic cultural and community life in the United States may be secured without the preservation of ethnic mother tongues." (Underlining mine.) Other leaders thought otherwise but were in the minority.

Many of these leaders did not have any negative attitudes toward the fact that their own children were unwilling to speak the ethnic tongue. Many explained that the children simply did not have any opportunity to use the ethnic tongue since most of their friends and other people they spoke to knew only English.

Another symptom of the dissociation between ethnic loyalty and language loyalty is the fact that those same children of ethnic leaders did not show any negative feelings of shame or hostility toward their ethnic heritage; how different from the attitude prevailing at the time the Anglo-American assimilating process was at its height. An ethnic writer tells us how traumatic it was:

> I begin to think that my grandmother is hopelessly a Wop. She's a small stocky peasant who walks with her wrists crisscrossed her belly, a simple old lady... When in her simple way, she confronts a friend of

> mine and says, her old eyes smiling, 'You lika
> go to the Seester scola? my heart roars. Managgia!
> I'm disgraced; now they all know that I'm an Italian.
>
> (From John Fante's "The Oddysey of a Wop" (in
> O. Handlin (ed.) Children of the Uprooted, New
> York: G. Braziller, 1966 cited in Krickus (1976).)

Negative attitudes toward ethnicity, on the part of both ethnics themselves and non-ethnics, have been diminishing in the United States in the last ten years, largely through the efforts of those engaged in the Civil Rights movement. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 put an end to the institutional disenfranchisement of Black Americans, the largest U.S. minority. Among other beneficial results for all minorities, the official granting of equal rights to blacks was accompanied by a surge in ethnic pride. For many it meant a healthy acceptance of their ethnic heritage, and many engaged in a search for their ethnic roots, the cultural patterns of their ancestors which now were seen as an inseparable part of the individual's own identity.

Unfortunately for language maintenance, ethnic cultural recovery did not automatically imply mother tongue recovery. Take for instance the case of bilingual-bicultural education. The deleterious effects of monolingual-monocultural Anglo-American education on ethnic children came finally to the attention of legislators. Legislation followed that was designed to put an end to the educational oppression of minorities. However, some of the programs instituted were transitional in character. In some cases, once the ethnic child had learned how to read and write in his/her non-English mother tongue and had learned English as a second language, the rest of his/her education would be mostly in English. (See Gaarder 1970.) Of course, this is but one model of the several that were adopted by different publicly-funded school districts throughout the country. The point is that bilingual-bicultural education does not automatically imply ethnic tongue maintenance.

Another manifestation of the dissociation between ethnicity and language maintenance--and one that should give pause to the language teaching profession--is the fact that the call for an educational system that takes into account the multicultural and pluralistic character of U.S. society has in general not been accompanied by a call to study languages other than English. In a recent annotated bibliography on multicultural education and ethnic studies in the U.S.[4], which contains abstracts of several hundred studies, less than a handful of the studies cited concern themselves with languages. It is true that the compilers of this bibliography state specifically that they are not including items on bilingual education. The point is however that the recommendation made to teachers to become aware of other cultural modes and other groups in our society (so that they can then transmit this awareness to their students) is seldom accompanied by a recommendation to become familiar with a language other than English. It may be that many of those involved in the movement toward a multiculturally inspired public educational system in the United States are themselves ethnics who, having gone only partially through the Anglo-American assimilating process did not lose their ethnicity but did lose their ethnic tongue and would now have to study it as a foreign language.

This brings us to the relationship between foreign language teaching and language maintenance in the United States, a quite complex and problematic state of affairs.

At the time LLUS appeared, this relationship practically did not exist. In fact the neglect of U.S. ethnic tongues (and of U.S. cultural-linguistic ethnic groups) extended to the field of foreign language instruction. To my knowledge no textbook of the commonly taught languages--French, German, Italian, Russian, and Spanish--presented systematically any linguistic or cultural aspects of the varieties of these languages spoken in the United States.

At that time, foreign languages were enjoying a great deal of recognition while ethnic languages enjoyed little or none. Although it cannot be said that the situation has exactly been reversed, the fact is that today 'foreign' languages are in crisis while 'languages other than English' spoken natively in the United States are receiving attention and support--and deservingly so. Bilingual-bicultural education exists (fortunately) and in many programs instruction is conducted in the non-English ethnic tongue.

Adding to the problems of the modern language field is a dichotomy, unfavorable to the profession, which has developed among some--perhaps many--U.S. educators. It could be expressed as follows:

The conventional study of foreign languages	Attention to ethnic languages
Irrelevant	Relevant
Elitist	Equalitarian
Useless to society	Urgently needed by society

After years of disinterest toward non-English speaking ethnics on the part of the foreign language profession, it is no wonder that these attitudes are held, especially when the disinterest continues in many sectors of our field.

Fortunately for the foreign language field its unpopularity among ethnics is not total. It seems there are people for whom ethnic heritage recovery includes language recovery or in some cases the acquisition of a tongue connected with their heritage (e.g. Hebrew, Swahili).

A recent survey of the Modern Language Association shows an increase in enrollment in many less commonly taught languages in U.S. colleges and universities between 1972 and 1974, the two years being compared.[5] The label 'less commonly taught' refers to languages other than Spanish, French, German, Italian, Russian, Latin, and Ancient Greek (which are the seven most commonly taught). This less commonly taught category includes many U.S. ethnic tongues. Enrollment figures are relatively modest. For instance Hebrew, the language with the heaviest enrollment, shows a registration total of 22,371. In some cases the figures are absolutely modest (e.g. there were nine students taking Scottish Gaelic in the U.S. in 1974).

Table II shows the languages that had an enrollment greater than 1,000, ranked by their respective totals:

TABLE II

Hebrew	22,371
Chinese	10,576
Japanese	9,604
Portuguese	5,073
Arabic	2,034
Swahili	1,694
Norwegian	1,557
Swedish	1,396
Polish	1,123
Yiddish	1,079

Of these, only Swahili showed a decrease (-27%) in the period 1972-1974. Of the languages listed in Table I, only Serbo-Croatian showed a decrease.

It is true that the figures for certain languages seem quite insignificant when one compares them with the number of speakers those languages have in the U.S. In addition not every student taking a given language does so for ethnic purposes.[6]

But if at least some of the students are indeed ethnics, it is a sign which the modern language profession should welcome profusely for it means that the attitude of separating ethnic loyalty from language loyalty is not general. Or, in other words, that at least some ethnics think that the key to a group's culture is the language spoken by the members of that culture. This, of course, has been one of the basic tenets of foreign language instruction in this country.

If it is true that language is the key to culture, then U.S. ethnics who 'betrayed' the ethnic mother tongue and who do not wish to recover it can never hope to completely understand themselves. If language and culture are inseparable, then U.S. ethnics who speak English natively and who are practically monolingual are more similar to other English-speaking monolinguals--including Anglo-Americans--than to ethnics of their same national group who speak the ethnic tongue natively or who have acquired it as a second language.

The inextricability of language and culture would also mean that a monolingual knowing only one culture would not be able to appreciate (and tolerate) other cultural possibilities. An educational system committed to the goals of cultural pluralism and tolerance for diversity would have to be manned by administrators and teachers who were at least bilingual. Because the people who are in a position to acquire two languages (and two cultures) exclusively from their life experiences are relatively few in number, if bilingualism for all were a societal desideratum many would have to acquire their second language in an educational setting. Clearly in such a society the teaching of non-native languages would not be regarded as irrelevant, elitist, or socially useless.

Instruction in many of the less commonly taught languages is available mainly in the several self-instructional language programs that have been established throughout the country (see Boyd-Bowman 1972). As to the most commonly taught languages, it is a fact that ethnics have been and continue to be attracted to conventional departments and programs where the tongue of their cultural group is taught as a foreign language.

Conventional departments are prepared--at least in theory--to attend to the needs of those ethnics who are English-speaking monolinguals

and who want to acquire as a second language the tongue of their cultural group which their parents or grandparents relinquished. What conventional departments are in general not prepared to do is to attend to the needs of U.S. ethnics who are either monolingual in the ethnic tongue or bilingual in any degree.

What are these needs and why is a conventional department not equipped to handle them? Consider first the case of monolinguals in the ethnic tongue. In this country English-speaking monolinguals are made to take English language courses as part of their educational training. These courses are designed to improve the students' utilization of a language they already know. The results of this training show in the speech and writing of educated speakers. Had they been educated in a country where their language is the official language and is thus the medium of education, U.S. ethnic tongue monolinguals would have undergone similar training in their native tongue. But it is obvious that the methodology of teaching a foreign language differs from that of teaching native language arts. The language courses offered in a conventional foreign language department were definitely not designed for natives, and natives can profit very little from them. Many things are taught in them that a native speaker already knows. In addition, in the U.S., foreign language methodology has been contrastive, i.e., the foreign language has been taught in terms of how it approximates, or differs from, English. For ethnics who do not know English, being subjected to contrastive instruction is absurd. (For a clear discussion of the methodological differences between native and foreign language instruction, see Fallis 1976.)

What about bilingual ethnics? Logically, conventional instruction is equally irrelevant for them if they are ethnic tongue dominant. But is it beneficial to them if they are English-dominant? Ethnics who know English and in addition have at least a passive knowledge of their ethnic tongue would in theory be better off than an English monolingual who starts at zero. In practice, however, the ethnic finds he does not have any advantage, for even though the tongue which he partially knows and that taught in the book go by the same name, they turn out to be different versions and the book's is deemed to be the correct one.

Unfavorable comparisons between an ethnic's lect and the standard are not limited to the lower levels of conventional instruction (i.e. the language courses per se) but are also encountered at the more advanced levels, especially in literature courses. Academic recruitment of minorities have brought many of the U.S. ethnic poor to college degree programs. Those who are ethnic tongue-dominant take courses in literature in conventional foreign language departments. (This is especially true of Puerto Ricans and Chicanos vis à vis departments where Spanish is taught.) But conventional literature courses are designed for students who have both a college-level reading ability and (at least in theory) a mastery of the standard form of the language in which its literature is written. Since the ethnic poor normally have neither, their performance in these courses is below average and they are penalized with low or failing grades. This is perceived by many ethnics as a manifestation of discrimination, a perception that is probably reinforced by the fact that conventional departments do not normally provide any type of remedial instruction that would prevent or alleviate those failures.

An issue greatly relevant to the related questions of language loyalty and language maintenance is the one surrounding the exclusive use in conventional foreign language instruction of the standard variety of the language. Traditionally many educators have had what Shuy (1969) has called an attitude of eradication vis à vis nonstandard lects. (See also Fallis 1976.) For the eradicators, the role of language instruction is to replace nonstandard forms by standard ones. In recent years sociolinguists have been proposing that educators embrace instead the goal of 'functional bidialectalism' or biloquialism, as Shuy (1969) calls it, and which he describes as "a person's right to continue speaking the dialect of his home (which may be nonstandard) even after he has learned a school dialect (which may be standard)."

Shuy was speaking primarily of standard and nonstandard forms of English but, as Fallis (1976) has shown, the terms are entirely applicable to the situation of non-English tongue ethnics in the U.S. Very probably because of their negative experiences with eradicators, non-English tongue ethnics have come to equate any proposals in favor of standard usage with the constellation of prejudices regarding nonstandard forms. This has coupled with an emerging ethnic pride to create among certain ethnics the attitude that biloquialism is an irrelevant goal. This attitude is exemplified in the response given by the Chicano linguist, Eduardo Hernández Chávez to a report issued by the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese, advocating the teaching of Spanish to its native speakers in the U.S. The writer of that report, A. Bruce Gaarder, saw as a major linguistic goal "to give the learner full command and literacy in world standard Spanish" (cited in Lovas 1975:119.) Wrote Hernández Chávez:

> ... our primary rationale for learning and maintaining Spanish is not so that it will serve as a link to Latin America, but so that it will become a strengthening and reinforcing bond for chicanismo within our own communities. Standard Spanish will not only detract us from this goal, it will be an alienating factor. We cannot go into our communities to talk to the people in standard Spanish and expect to effectively gain a feeling of confianza and carnalismo. To do this naturally and effectively, we must use the language of the people, our language, Pocho. (Cited in Lovas 1975:119)

When Weinreich developed the concept of language loyalty he had in mind the attitudes of purists rallying around a standard. If Hernández-Chávez's response is a reflection of widespread feelings among Chicanos, it would mean than that they are loyal to a nonstandard. But does 'dialect loyalty' lead to language maintenance the way language loyalty does?

The answer would seem to be no. A standard is easy to defend and promote because of its 'visibility'. Being highly codified, it is susceptible of improvement and refinement, including the conscious elimination of interference from other languages. But in a situation of language contact in the U.S. nothing stands between a noncodified lect and further Anglification.

It is almost axiomatic that language as a tool for wider communication can be improved. In discussing the properties that a standard should have in order to function efficiently, Garvin (1960:784) includes that of 'intellectualization' which he describes as "a tendency towards increasingly more definite and accurate expression". He goes on to say:

> In the lexicon, intellectualization manifests itself by increased terminological precision achieved by the development of more clearly differentiated terms. In grammar, intellectualization manifests itself by the development of word formation techniques and of syntactic devices allowing for the construction of elaborate, yet tightly knit, compound sentences, as well as the tendency to eliminate elliptic modes of expression by requiring complete constructions. (Garvin 1960:785).

Intellectualization would of course not be possible without codification, but codification and intellectualization are mutually supportive. The written language is the best vehicle for the improvement of expression, and improvement of expression in turn improves the code itself.

Yet in the highly charged atmosphere surrounding the standard vs. nonstandard issue, it is tantamount to an insult to say that communication in a nonstandard variety stands little chance of improvement and refinement if no effort is made for it to approach the standard code.

Surely Fishman (1966:379) was in no way trying to insult Italian Americans when among his specific recommendations for language maintenance in the United States he included the following:

> "Old Country" contact with naturalized citizens and their children should be fostered under favorable national circumstances. Italian governmental efforts to keep Italian language, literature, and customs alive may be thought of as a form of reverse lend-lease and may very well be a form of debt-repayment. Such efforts help to keep Italian alive and closer to its standardized form among Italo-Americans. They help overcome the constant Anglification and petrification that obtains when a language of immigrants does not have all of the normal avenues for use, growth, and change. (Underlining mine.)

It was only natural that in his recommendation Fishman did not include approaching conventional Italian departments in this country where the standard form of the language was taught and its literary monuments studied, for reasons we discussed in the foregoing. If he were to formulate his recommendations today he would still leave conventional departments out

of the picture since in general there has been little change in the realtionship (or lack of relationship) between the field of modern languages and U.S. ethnics. I am referring of course to languages in general, not only Italian.

If the United States were to adopt a language planning policy that had as its specific goal the maintenance and development of U.S. ethnic tongues it could not turn for expertise to the modern language field. The methodology for teaching ethnic language arts in the U.S. is still in its infancy and there is no general movement on the part of conventional departments to aid in its development. Furthermore eradicationist attitudes have in general not abated. No institutional rapprochment between U.S. ethnics and the foreign language field is in sight. Add to the list of symptoms of this ever widening gap between ethnics and the foreign language field the fact that bilingual-bicultural educational efforts have had institutionally very little to do with language departments. In what little language planning there exists in the United States today (i.e., bilingual bicultural education), the foreign language field has been largely left out. And yet if some significant attitudinal and methodological changes were to be made, what more adequate place to train teachers in the language and culture of a group than a language department, and what more adequate place to turn students into educated users of their own native language?

It seems, however, that those changes are not going to be made--at least not in the immediate future--and that language departments will continue to leave themselves out of the picture as far as organized U.S. ethnic language maintenance efforts are concerned.

NOTES

1. I would like to thank very especially Paul Garvin, Wolfgang Wölck, and Andrés Gallardo for their helpful suggestions. I am entirely responsible for any omissions and errors.

2. The source for this and all other Census figures was 1970 Census of the Population, Characteristics of the Population, United States Summary, United States Department of Commerce, 1973.

3. Recent U.S. Bureau of the Census estimates which became available to me after this paper was practically completed give a more revealing picture of the extent of multilingualism (and of individual bilingualism) in the United States. They are also revealing of the extent of 'language betrayal'. In a Survey of Languages conducted as a supplement of the monthly Current Population Survey in July, 1975, the estimated number of persons aged four and older living in households where languages other than English are spoken is 28,655,000. Of these, 25,334,000 are native Americans. Of the latter group, 1,238,000 live in households where English is not spoken at all, and 24,064,000 in households where both English and a non-English language are spoken. At the same time only 6,491,000 of the latter live in households where a non-English tongue is the usual language and 17,573,000 live in households where English is the usual language. For a detailed interpretation of these estimates see Waggoner (1976) from whom I have taken all figures.

4. Multicultural Education and Ethnic Studies in the United States: An Analysis and Annotated Bibliography of Selected Documents in ERIC, Ethnic Heritage Center for Teacher Education, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1976.

5. The source for the results of the survey was "Enrollments in less commonly taught languages, U.S. Colleges and Universities, Fall 1974" in A.D.F.L., Bulletin of the Association of Departments of Foreign Languages, Vol. 7, No. 3, March 1976.

6. In the Critical Languages Program that Professor Peter Boyd-Bowman directs at my institution, the students' ethnicity determines in general their choice in the case of Hebrew and certain European languages (e.g. Polish) but not in general in the case of Oriental languages (e.g. Japanese). (Peter Boyd-Bowman, personal communication.)

7. For a very interesting proposal concerning the creation of a new interdisciplinary field that would encompass both conventional language study and attention to the language needs of U.S. ethnic minorities, see Lambert (1975).

REFERENCES

Boyd-Bowman, Peter. 1972. National self-instructional program in Critical Languages. Modern Language Journal 56:164-7.

Fallis, Guadalupe V. 1976. Pedagogical implications of teaching Spanish to the Spanish-speaking in the United States. In: Teaching Spanish to the Spanish speaking: theory and practice, ed. by Guadalupe Valdes Fallis and Rudolfo Garcia Moya, Trinity University, San Antonio. 3-27.

Fishman, Joshua A. 1966. Planned reinforcement of language maintenance in the United States: suggestions for the conservation of a neglected national resource, In: Fishman et al, 369-91.

_____ and Vladimir C. Nahirny, John E. Hofman, and Robert G. Hayden. 1966. Language loyalty in the U.S. The Hague: Mouton.

_____ and John E. Hofman. 1966. Mother tongue and nativity in the American population. In: Fishman et al, 34-50.

_____ and Vladimir C. Nahirny. 1966. Organizational and leadership interest in language maintenance. In: Fishman et al, 156-89.

Gaarder, A. Bruce. 1970. The first seventy-six bilingual projects. In: Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1970, ed. by James Alatis. Georgetown University Press. 163-78.

Garvin, Paul L. 1960. The urbanization of the Guarani language--a problem in language and culture. In: Anthony F. C. Wallace, ed. Men and cultures, Selected Papers of the Fifth International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 783-90.

Glazer, Nathan. 1966. The process and problems of language maintenance: an integrative review. In: Fishman et al, 358-68.

_____ and Daniel P. Moynihan. 1963. Beyond the melting pot. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.

Greer, Colin. 1972. The great school legend. New York: Basic Books.

Krickus, Richard. 1976. Pursuing the American Dream: white ethnics and the new populism. Garden City: Anchor Books, Anchor-Doubleday.

Lambert, Wallace E. 1967. A social psychology of bilingualism. The Journal of Social Issues 23:91-109.

_____. 1975. An alternative to the foreign language teaching profession. Lektos 1, No. 2: 1-15.

Lovas, John C. 1975. Language planning in a multilingual community in the U.S. In: New directions in second language learning, teaching and bilingual education, ed. by Marina K. Burt and Heidi C. Dulay. TESOL, Washington, D.C. 113-22.

Shuy, Roger W. 1969. Bonnie and Clyde tactics in English teaching. The Florida FL Reporter 7:81-3, 160-1.

Waggoner, Dorothy. 1976. Results of the Survey of Languages Supplement to the July 1975 Current Population Survey. A paper presented at the Fifth Annual International Bilingual Bicultural Education Conference San Antonio, Texas, May 4, 1976.

Weinreich, Uriel. 1968. Languages in contact. The Hague: Mouton. (Originally published by the Linguistic Circle of New York, N.Y., 1953.)